



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/840,164	05/06/2004	Nicolai Kosche	188378/US/2	7512
<div>66083                      7590                      09/29/2009 DORSEY &amp; Whitney LLP on behalf of Sun Microsystems, Inc. 370 SEVENTEENTH ST. SUITE 4700 DENVER, CO 80202-5647</div>				
EXAMINER				
TECKLU, ISAAC TUKU				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2192				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/29/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/840,164

**Applicant(s)**

KOSCHE ET AL.

**Examiner**

ISAAC T. TECKLU

**Art Unit**

2192

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12, 14-27, 29-37, 39-42, 44-50, 52-56 and 58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12, 14-27, 29-37, 39-42, 44-50, 52-56 and 58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 4, 13, 28, 38, 43, 51 and 57 have been cancelled.
2. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-27, 29-37, 39-42, 44-50, 52-56 and 58 have been examined.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 01/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### **Argument:**

The Applicant argued that "In order to more clearly delineate the distinction between the claims and the disclosure from Yates, claims 1-3, 5-12, 14 and 15 are amended to clarify that the claimed 'software profiling tool' is a 'profiling' tool." (Remark, pp. 11).

#### **Response:**

In response to the above argument, the examiner would like to indicate that it is the profiling tool that determines at least one data address from one or more instruction instances (see at least col.2:25-25 and col.3-4:65-10). Thus, the amended claim does not clarify that the claimed profiling tool is different from the profiling disclosed in the prior art of record, Yates. It is clearly known that when a program is executed on a computer, the program refers to memory by virtual address. Furthermore, the profile information is recorded describing memory references made by the program, the profile information recording physical addresses of the profiled memory references. The prior art of record Yates teaches the concept of virtual memory address among others in the following cited columns.

Art Unit: 2192

“Particular embodiments of the invention may include one or more of the following features. The regions may be pages managed by a virtual memory manager. The indications may be stored in a virtual address translation entry, in a table whose entries are associated with corresponding virtual pages, in a table whose entries are associated with corresponding physical page frames, in entries of a translation look-aside buffer, or in lines of an instruction cache. The code at the first destination may receive floating-point arguments and return floating-point return values using a register-based calling convention, while the code at the second destination receives floating-point arguments using a memory-based stack calling convention, and returns floating-point values using a register indicated by a top-of-stack pointer.” (emphasis added – col. 4:45-55).

“Tapestry processor 100 fetches (stage 110) instructions from instruction cache (I-cache) 112, or from memory 118, from a location specified by IP (instruction pointer, generally known as the PC or program counter in other machines) 114, with virtual-to-physical address translation provided by I-TLB (instruction translation look-aside buffer) 116. The instructions fetched from I-cache 112 are executed by a RISC execution pipeline 120. In addition to the services provided by a conventional I-TLB, I-TLB 116 stores several bits 182, 186 that choose an instruction environment in which to interpret the fetched instruction bytes. One bit 182 selects an instruction set architecture (ISA) for the instructions on a memory page. Thus, the Tapestry hardware can readily execute either native instructions or the instructions of the Intel X86 ISA. This feature is discussed in more detail in section II, *infra*.” (emphasis added – col.22:45-55).

“At the next X86 instruction boundary 566, the information from the just-completed instruction is clocked from signals 558, 559, 561 to registers 568, 569, 570. Registers 568, 569, 570 are simply a buffer for time-shifting information about an X86 instruction to make it available during the next instruction, in case a profile event is to be captured. Because the native control transfer instruction is always the last instruction of the recipe for an X86 transfer instruction, the virtual-to-physical translation of the address of the destination of the transfer (especially in the case of a TLB miss) is not available until the transfer instruction itself is complete.” (emphasis added – col.69:40-55).

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the above argument is not persuasive and accordingly the rejection has been maintained as set forth in the Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-27, 29-37, 39-42, 44-50, 52-56 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yates, Jr. et al. (US 7,111,290 B1), hereinafter Yates.

As per claim 1 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses a tangible computer readable storage medium implemented software profiling tool that determines at least one data address from one or more instruction instances (col. 2:15-25 "... figures out the address ..." and col. 7:15-40 "... execution speed ... instance of instruction have an event code that leaves intact an event code previously determined..." and see at least col.6:60-67 and col.7:1-10), and that identifies one or more memory reference objects, which are associated with the data address, as hindering execution of code that includes the instruction instances, wherein the instruction instances correspond to the code execution hindrance, wherein the memory reference objects include virtually addressable memory (col. 6:51-59 "... profile information is recorded that records physical memory reference ..." and col. 7:15-40 "... execution speed ... instance of instruction have an event code that leaves

intact an event code previously determined ...”, col. 4:45-55, col.17:30-50 col.22:45-55 and col.69:40-55 – virtual address-).

As per claim 2 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 1 wherein the memory reference objects include one or more of physical memory reference objects and logical memory reference objects (col. 7:14-25 “... physical memory reference ... reference may record the event of a sequential execution flow...” and col. 17:15-20 “... memory references referring to logical address ...).

As per claim 3 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 2 wherein the physical memory reference objects include one or more of cache (e.g. Fig. 1a, 112 and related text), cache lines (col.88: 15-20 “.. cache lines...”), cache levels (e.g. Fig. 1c, DATA CACHE and related text), cache sub-blocks (e.g. Fig. 1c, 112 and related text), memory controllers (e.g. Fig. 1a, 124 and memory modification monitor and related text), addressable memory (e.g. Fig. 1c, 146 and related text), and memory-management page translation units (e.g. Fig. 1a, 170 and related text).

As per claim 5 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 2 wherein the logical memory reference objects include one or more of source-level data objects, memory segments (e.g. Fig. 1D and related text), heap variables (col. 30:40-50 “heap”), variable instances (col. 30:40-50 “state variable”), and stack variables (col. 30:40-50 “stack”).

As per claim 6 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 5 wherein the source-level data objects include one or more of functions (e.g. Fig. 1e and related text), statically linked objects (e.g. Fig. 1e, 56 and related text), data structures (e.g. Fig. 1e, 48 and related text), data types (e.g. Fig. 1e, 40 and related text), data type definitions (e.g. Fig. 1e, 32 and related text), operands (e.g. Fig. 3g, 317 and related text), and expressions (e.g. Fig. 3g, 317 and related text).

As per claim 7 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 6 wherein the statically linked objects include one or more of global variables and static variables (e.g. TABLE 1 and related text).

As per claim 8 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 1 wherein the software profiling tool includes one or more of a compiler, an interpreter (col. 19:20-40 "... interpreter..."), an optimization tool (col. 19:20-30 "... emulator..."), and a virtual machine (e.g. Fig. 1a, 118 and related text).

As per claim 9 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 1 wherein the code includes one or more of machine code (e.g. Fig. 1a, 118 and related text), byte code (col. 19:20-30 "... emulator..."), and interpreted code (col. 19:20-40 "... interpreter...").

As per claim 10 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 1 that also aggregates

addresses based on the memory reference objects (e.g. Fig. 1c and related text).

As per claim 11 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 10 wherein the software profiling tool utilizes at least a portion of the data addresses to aggregate the addresses (e.g. Fig. 1c and related text).

As per claim 12 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 10 that also provides the aggregated addresses and an indication of the code execution hindrance corresponding to the aggregated addresses for one or more of storage and display (e.g. Fig. 1c and related text)..

As per claim 14 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 1 wherein the code execution hindrance corresponds to one or more sampled runtime events (e.g. Fig. 1d and related text)..

As per claim 15 (Currently Amended), Yates discloses the software profiling tool of claim 14 wherein the sampled runtime events include one or more of cache misses, cache references, data translation buffer misses, data translation buffer references, and counter condition events (e.g. Fig. 1b and related text).

As per claim 16, Yates discloses a method for profiling code executing in a computer system, the method comprising:



identifying an instruction instance that corresponds to a runtime event col. 6:51-59 "... profile information is recorded that records physical memory reference ..." and col. 7:15-40 "... execution speed ... instance of instruction have an event code that leaves intact an event code previously determined ...");

determining a data address from the instruction instance (col. 2:15-25 "... figures out the address ..."); and

determining a memory reference object from the determined address (col. 7:14-25 "... physical memory reference ... reference may record the event of a sequential execution flow..." and col. 17:15-20 "... memory references referring to logical address ...), wherein the data address includes a virtual address in the computer system see also, col. 4:45-55, col.17:30-50 col.22:45-55 and col.69:40-55).

As per claim 17, Yates discloses the method of claim 16 wherein the runtime event is a sampled runtime event (e.g. Fig. 6c, 650 and related text).

As per claim 18, Yates discloses the method of claim 16 wherein identifying the instruction instance comprises backtracking from a second instruction instance to the instruction instance (e.g. Fig. 650 and related text).

As per claim 19, Yates discloses the method of claim 16 wherein determining the address from the instruction instance comprises decoding the instruction instance (e.g. Fig. 5b, 556 and related text).

As per claim 20, Yates discloses the method of claim 19 further comprising:  
decoding the instruction instance if a register that hosts the instruction instance  
is determined as valid (e.g. Fig. 5b, 556 and related text).

As per claim 21, Yates discloses the method of claim 20 wherein determining if the register  
is valid comprises:

applying reverse register transformation with respect to the runtime event (e.g. Fig. 3d and  
related text); and

determining whether the register is valid based on the applied reverse register transformation  
(e.g. Fig. 1d and related text).

As per claim 22, Yates discloses the method of claim 16 wherein the memory reference  
object includes a physical memory reference object or a logical memory reference object (col. 7:14-  
25 "... physical memory reference ... reference may record the event of a sequential execution  
flow..." and col. 17:15-20 "... memory references referring to logical address ...").

As per claim 23, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed  
above (Claim 3), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as  
set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 24, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed  
above (Claim 4), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as  
set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 25, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 6), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 26, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 7), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 27, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 8), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 29, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 10), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 30, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 11), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 31, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 12), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 32, this is the computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 16), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 33, Yates discloses a method of profiling code executing in a computer, the method comprising:

associating data addresses with memory reference objects, wherein the data addresses have been determined from instruction instances corresponding to code execution hindrance (col. 2:15-25 “... figures out the address ...”); and

aggregating the data addresses based on their associated memory reference objects (e.g. Fig. 1c and related text), wherein the data addresses include virtual addresses in the computer system (see also, col. 4:45-55, col.17:30-50 col.22:45-55 and col.69:40-55).

As per claim 34, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 8), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 35, this is the method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 14), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 36, this is another method version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 17), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 37, this is another method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 15), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 39, this is another method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 11), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 40, Yates discloses this is the computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 33), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 41, Yates discloses a method of profiling code in a computer system comprising:  
identifying an instruction instance corresponding to a runtime event (col. 2:15-25 "... figures out the address ...") and col. 7:15-40 "... execution speed ... instance of instruction have an event code that leaves intact an event code previously determined...");

determining whether the instruction instance is valid (col. 6:51-59 "... profile information is recorded that records physical memory reference ..." and col. 7:15-40 "... execution speed ... instance of instruction have an event code that leaves intact an event code previously determined ...");

decoding the instruction instance to extract at least a portion of a data address(e.g. Fig. 5b, 556 and related text)

if the instruction instance is valid (e.g. Fig. 5b, 556 and related text);

determining a memory reference object with the extracted portion of the address (col. 7:14-25 "... physical memory reference ... reference may record the event of a sequential execution flow..." and col. 17:15-20 "... memory references referring to logical address ..."); and

aggregating the data address with other addresses based at least in part on the memory reference object, wherein the memory reference object includes virtual addresses in the computer system (see also, col. 4:45-55, col.17:30-50 col.22:45-55 and col.69:40-55 and e.g. Fig. 1c and related text).

As per claim 42, this is another method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 10), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 43, this is another method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 13), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 44, this is another method version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 14), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 45, this is another method version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 21), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 46, this is the computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 41), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 47 (Currently Amended), this is the computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 41), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 48, this is the computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 42), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 49, this is the computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 45), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 50, this is the computer program product version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 13), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 53, this is the computer program product version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 6), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 54, this is computer program product version of the claimed software profiling tool discussed above (Claim 7), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 55 (Currently Amended), this is the apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 41), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.



As per claim 56, this is the apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above (Claim 42), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Yates.

As per claim 58, Yates discloses the apparatus of claim 56 wherein the processor includes event condition counters (col. 2:15-25 "... counters will indicate ...").

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ISAAC T. TECKLU whose telephone number is (571) 272-7957. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:30A - 8:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Isaac T Tecklu/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192